DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 113 SO 002 394

AUTHOR	Gray, Donald J.
TITLE	The Lessons of Summer Institutes.
INSTITUTION	Consortium of Professional Associations.
PUB DATE	Apr 70
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Improvement; Educational Innovation; Higher Education; Humanities; Improvement Programs; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Social Sciences; *Summer Institutes; Summer Programs; Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program; NDEA Institutes

ABSTRACT

This report provides a broad overview of previous NDEA institute evaluation reports on summer institutes two or more summers ago. Emphasis is on how to make the institutes more effective. Primary purposes of the summer institutes are to: 1) change what and how students learn in elementary and secondary school classrooms; and, 2) change college and university teachers and courses in which prospective teachers are educated. Common patterns as to participants, faculty characteristics, and structured content are evident in these reports. Institutes concentrated on narrow topics organized around a period, problem, or theme, and attempted to teach something new and innovative. Effective institutes are exemplary, advanced, innovative, intense and cogent motivating forces. Institutes are most successful in renewing teacher's interest in and teaching them something new about the content of their subject, but less successful in helping teachers change their teaching methods, or to use different and new material and media in their courses. Experiences of the summer institutes indicate that college and university teachers need to understand the limits, possibilities, and politics of teaching in the schools, about what can be changed, and how changes occur in a system. (Author/SJM)

ED 061113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE LESSONS OF SUMMER INSTITUTES

by

Donald J. Gray

SP 002 394

CONPASS

Consortium of Professional Associations
for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

April, 1970

FOREWORD

A decade has passed since the first NDEA Institutes for teachers were initiated through congressional foresight and action. During this period tens of thousands of teachers have participated in university - organized attempts to improve the quality of in-service training, in the humanities and social sciences. To measure the significance of this major innovation in American Education, a variety of approaches have been taken: independent and cooperative evaluation by disciplines of institutes organized around the discipline; and outside evaluation by measurement and testing authorities with the help of representatives of the disciplines. These evaluation efforts have been both formative and summative, that is, they have served to improve institutes during the process of evaluation and to change institutes as a result of the evaluation.

The history of the NDEA Institute effort has not yet run its course. Clearly, however, the time has come to assess the results of this major endeavor in the broadest possible terms. Such an assessment is critical to federal policy making on such vital issues as whether funding foci should favor pre-rather than in - service training or new problem - oriented approaches to learning, rather than traditional disciplinarily rooted approaches.

Donald J. Gray, of Indiana University, was commissioned by CONPASS to review a wide variety of NDEA Institute evaluation reports and to provide an overview of these efforts. His success in responding to the charge relates not only to his scholarly and literary talents, but to his personal sense of involvement in the institute effort. We are deeply indebted to Dr. Gray for his work.

Saul B. Cohen
Chairman
CONPASS Board

The Lessons of Summer Institutes

by Donald J. Gray

This report is two steps, and at least two years, away from the reality whose lessons it presumes to extract. The reality is what happened in, and as a result of, the several thousand summer institutes which have been conducted for elementary and secondary school teachers in the humanities and social sciences since the first NDEA institutes for teachers of modern foreign language were taught in the summer of 1959. The successes and failures of these institutes have already been carefully distilled, especially in three sets of reports: Joseph Axelrod's summary evaluations of the institutes for teachers of modern foreign languages; the reports on the NDEA institutes in geography, history, and English taught in the summer of 1965; and the reports commissioned by CONPASS on the institutes taught in the summer of 1966 to teachers of civics, industrial arts, economics, art, music, theater, and Latin, and to trainers of teachers. This report is a further distillation, a summary of these summaries of how it was in institutes two and three or more summers ago.

From such a distance, I will not try to record the often remarkable character and practices of individual institutes. Nor am I centrally concerned here to judge the effectiveness of certain kinds of institutes, or of summer institutes in the large. For one thing, the evidence which matters - how institutes have changed, what happens in elementary and secondary school classrooms - is not yet available. Further, those who taught and learned in institutes have not awaited this report, or its

predecessors, to put to use the lessons of their summers. Institutes change institutes too, and judgments even on the recent past cannot fairly be trusted to describe the present.

I will rather use the descriptions, judgments, and opinions put forward in the previous reports to try to define and encourage possibilities which institutes seem to have discovered for themselves, and which they have sometimes suggested for other means of educating teachers as well. I will first briefly lay out the common pattern and purposes of the institutes described in the reports. Then I will epitomize the opinions of my predecessors about which patterns and purposes are most promising, and where the most interesting difficulties lay. There are two sets of lessons to be drawn from this common experience. One concerns future summer institutes and other ways to teach teachers outside the conventional graduate and undergraduate curricula. The other concerns the possibility, even the need, of changing conventional curricula so that they incorporate or match the discoveries and achievements of the institutes. I wish to emphasize this second set of lessons. The changes summer institutes ought to work on the schools, and on the institutes of subsequent summers, have been thoroughly discussed and sometimes effected. But university teachers and administrators have been more quick to find reasons and ways to change other people than they have been to learn in institutes those lessons which might change them too.

PATTERNS

Clear trends as to structure, participants, and faculty are evident in these reports. Typically, the institutes described enrolled 40 or 50 elementary or secondary school teachers in six to eight weeks of daily instruction. The participants were characteristically in their 30's, had taught for more

than five and fewer than ten years, were will-educated in the subjects they taught (perhaps about one-half had taken undergraduate majors in their subjects), and were good and confident teachers. More men than women have attended the institutes. There have been many more institutes designed for secondary school teachers than for elementary school teachers, more for teachers from well-appointed, largely college preparatory schools than for teachers of disadvantaged students, and more for school teachers than for college teachers or school administrators. The faculties of these institutes have been also characteristically young, usually from a college or university, as many held a PhD and taught in an academic department as held on EdD and taught in a School of Education, and almost exactly as often had little or no experience with the actualities of teaching in the schools.

A definite structural pattern for the content of the institutes was apparent. The institute usually offered two or three courses in one or related subjects. One course, usually called the "workshop", was given to discussion of methods and materials of instruction. Increasingly, institutes were set to concentrate on narrow rather than broad topics, to be organized around a period in history or a problem in historiography, or around a common theme addressed by several courses in geography or political science, or even around the methods and materials for teaching a concretely articulated secondary school course. Increasingly too the courses are planned to teach something new to well-prepared teachers rather than to try to remedy the deficient undergraduate educations of badly prepared teachers.

PURPOSES

The ground, but usually unspoken, purpose of summer institutes is to change what and how students learn in elementary and secondary school

classrooms. The ways in which the directors and faculties of institutes set about accomplishing this purpose may be sorted into attempts:

1. somehow to change elementary and secondary school teachers: to teach them something new about their subjects, or about how to teach it, or just to excite and interest them again in their subjects and in themselves as teachers;
2. to change elementary and secondary school courses by actually inducting participants in the nature and uses of already prepared curricula, syllabi, and teaching materials;
3. somehow to change college and university teachers: to persuade them to learn about the possibilities and limits of teaching in the schools; to engage them in the education of teachers on their own campuses; even to make them aware of the necessity of learning to teach differently themselves;
4. to change the college and university courses and programs in which prospective teachers are educated.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Because the purpose of summer institutes is to change for the better how elementary and secondary school students are taught, a satisfying answer to the question of whether they were successful must await the completion of the Project Impact study commissioned by CONPASS. Now only a tentative, partial judgment is possible, based on the opinions of people who have attended, taught in, and written reports about institutes. Their judgment is, on the whole, extremely favorable. The reports are filled with the results of questionnaires on which anywhere from two-thirds to 90% of the participants rate their institutes as exhilarating, intellectually

stimulating, or outstanding; with freely volunteered comments by participants which ring with excitement and gratitude; and with the observations of visitors and evaluators who find a peculiar life, intensity, and cogency in summer institutes. Apparently, this general enthusiasm survives the summer. James Lea Cate, writing about some of the participants in the history institutes of 1965, says that the opinions of nearly half these teachers about their institutes were even more favorable a year later than they were at its end (Cate, 1966, p. 7). Almost all these teachers still thought that the institute had been intellectually stimulating, and 83% thought that the institute had changed their teaching in general, usually (said three-fourths of them) by encouraging them to add new topics to the content of the course (pp. 16-17). Like others before him, Professor Cate too, had "tended to under-rate the institutes", ended his report confident that they had done much to improve teaching in the schools (p. 45).

The reports are also full of words which name some of the sources of this general confidence in the effectiveness of the institutes. A list of characteristics included in James Brown's report on the institutes in educational media taught in 1966 may stand for all, or at least for all the good summer institutes in humanities and social sciences taught in the past decade. Effective institutes are well planned but flexible; exemplary in their courses, texts, and methods; varied in their use of lectures, laboratories, and seminars; advanced and innovative in their content; practical in their effects but not themselves centrally given to instruction in how to teach (Brown, 1966, pp. 1-3, 1-4). To this list can be added qualities named in other reports: the coherence and resonance attained by a focus on one topic and one end (the improvement of teachers, if not of teaching itself); a

liberation from the courses, requirements and teaching practices of conventional graduate programs; a sense of the nature of a discipline, of what history or economics is and how it is done; a sense of community with other teachers of a subject, in universities as well as in schools. Finally, there seems to be abroad in summer institutes a sense of reward and commitment, a feeling among the participants and faculty that they have been chosen or have elected to do something special and important and that therefore it really matters that they use their summer fully and effectively.

There are distinct if as yet unformulated lessons here for anyone who is curious or anxious about why teaching and learning in a summer institute are often more satisfying than teaching and learning in diffuse, rigid, and fragmented undergraduate and graduate programs nailed down by required courses. There are also some more specific conclusions to be drawn about the kind and conduct of effective institutes themselves, and it will be well, as a kind of testament to their achievement, to set out some of the lessons of these successes before moving on to consider where summer institutes failed, and what future institutes and other kinds of teacher education can learn from their difficulties.

I chose three lessons, from many stated or implied in the reports. First, the observation that successful institutes are exemplary, advanced, and innovative moves easily in the reports to the judgment that institutes are successful <u>because</u> they are exemplary, advanced, and innovative. There is a prevalent bias in the reports against institutes which are remedial in their purposes and which rehearse the content and means of conventional undergraduate and graduate courses, and toward institutes which are experimental, which try to educate already competent teachers in fresh ways of

seeing or teaching their subjects.

Similarly, the observation that successful institutes are intense and cogent leads to a bias toward institutes which seem to be effective because their several courses all fit in tightly around a theme, a problem, a way of teaching, or a conception of a particular subject. This observation of the coherence of effective institutes also leads to hard judgments of habits which compromise their cogency. Guest lectures, for example, which are almost always criticized as irrelevant and distracting, or any event or course which doesn't fit neatly and clearly with the others is liable to the same judgment. John Thompson's distinction between over-scheduling and overwork is apt here: participants who thought they were overworked in the institute were often simply oppressed by badly organized days full of courses plus "conferences, tutorials, special lectures, films, and social activities" (Thompson, 1966, p. 18, report of 1965 history institutes). The report on the civics institutes of 1966 is stronger yet: its authors thought the institutes came close to failure because their directors had not decided what could be done and what most mattered in the terms of the institute (Longaker & Cleary, 1966, p. 3).

Finally, the reports place successful institutes at a fertile confluence of the liberal and the practical, the discipline and its pedagogy. When institutes worked, they did so because they afforded a meeting (if not yet a marriage) of people accustomed to study a subject for its own sake and people accustomed to thinking about how it can be taught. Whatever difficulties this conjunction may create - and there are some difficulties - it does contribute importantly to the peculiar glow and excitement generated when people who teach in and know about schools think of themselves for a

term as colleagues with geographers and literary scholars, and when geographers and literary scholars commit themselves for a term to questions about what a course in their subject ought to look like in elementary or secondary schools, and how to teach others to teach it.

DIFFICULTIES AND PROMISES

If the judgments contained in the reports announce the institutes to be successful in general, they also indicate that on the whole the institutes accomplished some of their purposes more successfully than others. Where the institutes seem to have been most effective, their success suggests how other means of educating teachers might change to achieve similar effects. And where the institutes have been relatively ineffective, their difficulties mark what there is yet to do, both in institutes and in the conventional programs of teacher education which institutes have tried to complement and change.

Consider again the four purposes named above as common to the summer institutes in humanities and social sciences.

1. Somehow to change elementary and secondary school teachers. The institutes were most successful in teaching teachers something new about the content of their subjects and in renewing the interest which presumably persuaded them to study it in the first place. The institutes were, by several measures, much less successful in helping teachers to actually change the methods of their teaching, or to use different material or media in their courses.

Consistently in their responses to questionnaires, the participants profess themselves disappointed in the instruction they received, or did not receive, about how to teach. The statistics in the report by Professors

Reese and Darcy on the institutes in economics are typical. They record a very high number (76) of favorable responses and very few (2) low ratings to a question about the success of the institutes in imparting knowledge about economics. They also record only about as many favorable (20 and 24) as unfavorable (21 and 19) responses to questions about the success of the institutes in imparting knowledge of instructional methodology and materials (Reese & Darcy, 1966, pp. 10-12). (For what it is worth - and the authors themselves are cautious - they also report that on a standard test the participants in four of the five institutes, displayed an increase in their knowledge of economics from the beginning to the end of the institute, p.9.) About two-thirds of the teachers Professor Cate (1966) queried a year after their attendance at an institute thought that instruction in teaching methods was only good (38%) or average (24%), while over 80% of them thought that instruction in the matter of history was excellent (38%) or good (43%). It is to be expected that most of the changes these teachers made in their own courses, as I have remarked earlier, was to add new topics or new interpretations of familiar topics, rather than to change the strategies or materials with which they taught.

There is a difference, although not in effect an important one, between the kinds of neglect practiced by institutes in their attention to the methods of teaching, on the one hand, and teaching materials and media - syllabi, textbooks, audiovisual media, etc. - on the other. New teaching material and media were pretty much ignored, neither discussed nor used. For example, the report by Professors Shugrue, Barth, and Ruth (1966) on the uses of the ample and careful course plans and supplementary material distributed by the English Institute Materials Center concludes that the mater-

ials were not well used in the English institutes taught in the summer 1966. Their directors and faculties just "did not take seriously enough their responsibility to incorporate new materials into the institute program," and sometimes could not even imagine the relationship between the deliberate study of a discipline and the deliberate study of how someone tried to make a course to teach the discipline (pp. 7-8). Almost all the reports remark a similar failure to teach participants how to use audiovisual and other media, and even to use in the institute any means of instruction except the familiar mix of textbook, lecture, and occasional discussion. Here too one of the prime causes seems to be that the directors and faculties of institutes just don't know much about new materials and media, and are not very much interested in learning about them. (When they do learn, as in the one-week special media institute programs conducted in the spring of 1966 for some of the directors of institutes to be taught that summer, they do frequently begin to enlarge and vary the uses of educational media; but the directors who attended these programs may have been those interested in new educational media to begin with. See Donald Brown and James Brown's [1966, pp. 60-62] report on the effects of special media institute programs.)

On the other hand, the institutes typically did deliberately try, usually in workshops or demonstration classes, at least to permit participants to devise, read about, or observe certain methods of teaching. But these courses were also typically shunted to the periphery of the institute - taught in the afternoons or late in the term, conducted by the only teacher on the staff who was not a member of a college or university faculty, denied the prestige of carrying graduate credit. The effect of either kind of neglect was the same. <u>What</u> became more important than <u>how</u>: institutes

became instruments primarily for teaching the matter of a subject to people whose professions required them not to stop there, but somehow to go on to figure out how to teach others the matter they had learned.

This difficulty is usually called in the reports the problem of transfer. It was prevalent, large, and unresolved two years ago, and it is now almost certainly no smaller and not yet resolved. The usual argument, in fact, is not to resolve but to ignore the difficulty by claiming that competent teachers need only to be taught their subjects; they themselves will work out how to teach it. (I confess that this argument is vigorously advanced in my report on the arts and humanities institutes: my reading of other reports has tempered my advocacy.) But the teachers queried in Professor Cate's study have not found new ways to teach the new information and ideas they learned in their institutes. Furthermore, simply to trust that the participants will solve for themselves the problem of transfer is to foreclose one of the most interesting possibilities of institutes: the chance that college and university teachers will learn something when they directly engage themselves in questions of what a school course in their subject ought to contain, and how it ought to be taught.

One of the reasons this difficulty is so baffling in institutes is that it is, in summer dress, a version of the difficulty of "methods" courses in the conventional undergraduate curriculum, and, beyond that, of the entire relationship on college and university campuses between matter and method, academic departments and schools of education. Its resolution thus lies in part outside institutes, in the readiness of their faculties to change the ways in which they teach teachers during the year as well as during the summers. But some institutes have addressed the difficulty more directly.

Their faculties have framed and answered very precise questions about how to teach because they have quite deliberately placed first the second common purpose of institutes.

2. To change elementary and secondary school courses. Summer institutes in humanities and social sciences have not been as consistently used to induct teachers into carefully articulated courses and curricula, as, for example, institutes were used to establish new curricula in mathematics, biology, and physics in the schools. The institutes for teachers of modern foreign language have propagated the audiolingual method of teaching. Some institutes in art and music in 1966 were organized around the syllabi and materials for quite specifically conceived courses which would alter the conventional emphasis on craft and performance to the more liberal intention of studying the nature and history of art or music. Either before or during summer institutes, some college and university teachers who taught in or visited them wondered whether it might not be profitable to work out, for example, what a history or economics or geography course in secondary schools ought to contain; whether, for example, secondary school courses in industrial arts ought to include "a general education study of industry and its technology" (Hackett, Schad & Stake, 1966, p. 1) as well as courses in the craft of a trade.

The results of the Impact Study will determine whether participants in institutes are more likely than, say, the teachers queried for Professor Cate's report, to change their own courses if they have learned in the institute the content and rationale of a specific course, or if they have worked through and refined materials for it, or have practiced or seen practiced a particular method of teaching. Whatever may have happened when

they went home, there is some evidence that participants who attended institutes which did promote a way to teach (the modern foreign language institutes) or a specific course (some of the arts and humanities institutes) were unusually satisfied at the end of the institute with its instruction in pedagogy. (Thus, 70% or more of the participants in each of three arts and humanities institutes which promoted a concretely articulated course thought that the amount of time given to "presenting information on instructional methodology" was "about right", while usually no more than half, and sometimes fewer, of the participants in the other arts and humanities institutes were so satisfied, Cates, 1966, p. 33.) There is also the weight in the reports of words like exemplary, innovative, and practical; and the bias in many of the reports (including this one) towards institutes which are narrow and precise in their focus. Trying out a specific course or a full and coherent set of materials is not the only way to tighten an institute, and to help assure that it sets an example which really changes something. But it is one way, and it has to recommend it an evident consonance with one of the purposes and some of the qualities common in institutes judged to be successful by their participants, faculties, and visitors.

If summer institutes were to be more commonly used to propagate some fully specified ideas about courses and methods, where will these ideas and methods come from? Not from institutes: ambitions to create courses and materials in institutes have usually been disappointed. Yet the fate of the curricula and materials distributed by the English Institute Materials Center is equally discouraging to ambitions which would use institutes to disseminate ideas worked out by people not on their faculties. The lesson seems to be that if they are to serve effectively as an important element in

an institute, new courses and materials must somehow win a commitment from the members of its faculty. The question now becomes one of how such a commitment can be won. That question reaches beyond institutes themselves.

Suppose the Modern Language Association, or the American Historical Association, or any professional association like those represented in CONPASS, decides to endorse one or two of the several curricula and sets of materials which have in the past five or six years been prepared and tried out in schools - for example, those prepared in the U. S. Office of Education's Project English. Or suppose that one of these associations, in concert with teachers and administrators in the schools and with colleagues in schools and departments of education, decides to commission the preparation of such courses and materials. The road then winds back to summer institutes. But summer institutes are first, perhaps, for the faculties of the next summer's institutes so they can be educated in the new courses and materials, given a chance to alter and refine their means and ends, to learn why they are made as they are, and to help decide what elementary and secondary school teachers need to know to teach them.

The road can also lead quite directly into the undergraduate and graduate courses in which prospective teachers are prepared. If elementary and secondary school teachers frequently leave summer institutes somehow changed themselves but without any idea of how to change anything else, that is because those who teach them in summer institutes frequently have no idea either. Suppose that in the summer institutes to which they come as participants or teachers, members of college and university faculties learn something quite concrete about the schools and what might be effective in them. Then summer institutes might begin to accomplish two other purposes more

decisively than they do now: they might begin to change college and university teachers too, who in turn might take home with them a new knowledge of the schools and a new perspective on their discipline which will persuade them to change the courses they teach during the year.

3. Somehow to change college and university teachers. Summer institutes were from the beginning conceived to be a means of enlisting the energies of people who were apart from, and even disdainful of the problems and possibilities of educating teachers. Institutes have enlisted these energies, those of businessmen and composers, poets and psychologists as well as scholars in the humanities and social sciences. One effect has been to change the college and university teachers who have taught in the institutes in much the same way that the participants they taught were changed. The faculties too were characteristically excited by the intensity and pace of the institute, by the chance to teach closely with colleagues from other disciplines, to learn something of the schools, and to enter their subjects in a different way. The report on the institutes in civics sums it up for almost all the institutes: they "ended in producing a special kind of commitment to civic education, on the part of many whose interest was marginal to begin with" (Longaker & Cleary, 1966, p. 1).

As with the changes worked on elementary and secondary school teachers, however, there remains the question of whether and how these changed teachers are going to change things when they return to their campuses. Putting aside for a paragraph or two the central matter of whether they will change the content and ways of the courses in which prospective teachers are educated, there are two other changes which seem to be recommended by the experience of institutes.

First, for all their new-found commitment, the faculties of summer institutes don't know much about the limits, possibilities, and politics of teaching in the schools - about what can be changed, and how change happens in a school or a school system. Nor, two years ago, anyway, were they much concerned to learn. It is difficult, encountering in report after report the high opinion in which participants held their teachers and the low probability they had learned anything which could be taken over directly into their own classrooms, not to imagine that a kind of unconscious compact had been made. Flattered by the assumption that they themselves can best translate all they learned into what they had to teach, the participants in return assured the faculty that its ignorance of their classrooms didn't matter. It has not yet been demonstrated that this assumption was faulty, and this reassurance false. But it is likely nonetheless that if college and university teachers know something about the courses, textbooks, classrooms, equipment, students, and administration of the schools in which their students (on campus as well as in institutes) will teach, they might very well perceive new things to say about their subjects in and out of summer institutes, and new ways in which to say them.

A second change recommended by the experience of summer institutes is that members of their faculties ought to learn to lecture less and to listen more, that they need to devise ways which will permit the participants actually to participate in their own educations. (Along the way, the participants might also educate the faculty: one way for the college and university faculty members who teach in institutes to learn about the schools is to allow the participants to talk about them.) The institutes have been, to

use Professor Brown's word, varied in the modes of teaching practiced in them. Lectures, seminars, field trips, observing, and teaching in demonstration classes, studios, films, participants teaching participants: all have been tried in one institute or another. Yet almost every report sets out a significant number of complaints by participants and observations by visitors that the faculties and schedules of institutes, as the report on the history institutes puts it, did not often enough give participants a chance to talk back, "to mull over key issues," "to think about how they can relate. . . new information to their own teaching," or just to observe "a range of teaching strategies and techniques." (Thompson, 1966, p. 16). For example, about one-quarter of the participants in the arts and humanities institutes wanted more studios and seminars, and nearly half of them wanted more individual study periods: only 5.8% wanted more lectures, and 19% thought there were too many lectures (p. 28). The report on the geography institutes of 1965 also regrets the "marked overuse" of lectures, and remarks that the faculties of institutes were often imprisoned as well within the bounds of a single textbook and objective tests (p. 11). By a nice turn of circumstance, even the college and university teachers who attended institutes for trainers of teachers complained that they were too often lectured to, and that their own experience as teachers was not called on (p. 10).

This last point is well taken. The faculties of summer institutes have not exploited one of the peculiar characteristics of summer institutes - that they are usually attended by competent and experienced teachers. It seems to be true, as the authors of the reports on the history (Thompson, 1966, p. 22) and economics (Reese & Darcy, 1966, p. 5)

institutes remark, that elementary and secondary school teachers resent being taught by other elementary and secondary school teachers. But somewhere short of such an abdication to their experience, there ought to be ways formally and consistently to use what participants know: for example, seminars and tutorials whose content is decided by participants after the institute is underway; courses in which college teachers first say what they think ought to be done, and school teachers then take over the course to tell them why it can't be done that way, and how it can be done; demonstration classes in which faculty as well as participants try out material and tactics to whose use they are committed; meetings late in the term to permit participants to help plan next summer's institute, or even better, to plan a series of events which will lodge and amplify the effects of the institute in their own schools. Even if the members of the faculties of institutes don't learn anything about schools in such seminars and discussions, by trying them out they will at least learn and demonstrate that there are other and less magisterial ways to teach than simply to leaven lectures with an occasional discussion section and to relieve textbooks with an occasional slide or map.

The possibility of using the experience of participants in summer institutes opens to another possibility outside them. The institutes for teachers of modern foreign language have in nearly a decade enrolled only a third of the elementary and secondary school teachers of modern foreign language in the country. That third has played a large role in changing the ways most foreign language teachers teach, because they returned to their schools with ideas about teaching precise enough to be taught and demonstrated to others. One lesson of this achievement is the benefit of

sending people home from institutes with a clearly articulated notion of what to do in their own classrooms. Another lesson is the possible benefit of using alumni of summer institutes to enlarge and advance their effects. Now teachers returning from institutes seem most often to do little more outside their own classrooms than to tell an after-school faculty meeting what they did last summer. If they are to do more, the college and university teachers who serve on the faculties of institutes are going to have to help them. They can help plan and teach in year-long in-service programs, help to prepare and revise new textbooks and curricula, maybe even seek and accept fellowships which will put them in schools or on the administrative staffs of a city or state educational agency for the year in which an in-service program or a new curriculum is being tried. College and university teachers can, in a word, make themselves responsible for joining with the teachers they have taught to invent ways in which the achievements of summer institutes reach to touch and change that majority of teachers who will never attend them.

The word responsibility can sum up all that the reports suggest about how the experience of summer institutes might profitably change their faculties. In institutes many college and university teachers have been engaged by the chance to change how elementary and secondary school students learn. They have not, most of them, ridden that chance as far as it and they can go. They have not informed themselves about the schools they are trying to change, accommodated how they teach to the peculiar possibilities of teaching experienced teachers, opened themselves to the risks and discoveries of trying out and creating new materials and means, devised ways to continue their commitment to the purposes of the institute

after it has adjourned. Nor, as the authors of the reports on the institutes in history and economics emphatically point out, have they and their colleagues on their own campuses come to regard teaching teachers of their subject to be a professional responsibility equivalent in its importance to the traditional tasks of research in a discipline and teaching graduate students and undergraduates as if all of them were also to become scholars in it. For all their commitment and distinct achievements, the members of the faculties of summer institutes in humanities and social sciences are still, most of them, summer soldiers.

4. <u>To change the college and university courses and programs in which prospective teachers are educated</u>. As the seasonal engagement of their faculties would predict, this purpose of institutes has been least satisfactorily effected. Looking back on eight years of modern foreign language institutes, Joseph Axelrod concludes: "on the whole, this rich experience has not yet been put to use on our own campuses; . . . the profession hasn't really taken advantage of the knowledge it has gained" (PMLA, 14). Only recently has this purpose been directly attempted, in the summer institutes for trainers of teachers in which school and university teachers and administrators studied new ideas about a particular subject and new ways of teaching prospective teachers to teach it. But this last purpose of summer institutes has from the beginning been implicit and important in the practice of bringing together for a summer college and university teachers who can learn from one another, and use what they learn during the academic year as they separately educate prospective teachers in a discipline and in its pedagogy.

Why haven't the institutes changed the conventional curriculum? It

is another question of transfer: why is it so difficult to enact in one kind of education possibilities discovered and often realized in another? Professor Axelrod blames the System (his capitalization), "which is so inflexible as to allow only the most innocuous modifications by individuals" (PMLA, p. 14). The authors of the reports on the more recently inaugurated institutes in history and arts and humanitites have not had time to be disappointed in the System; they tend to blame the members of institute faculties, who have not given much thought to how or even whether they ought to change how they teach during the year. It must also be said that certain qualities of summer institutes are simply not portable to regular undergraduate and graduate programs.

To consider this last point first, summer institutes are attended by teachers who bring along their own experience and competence. These institutes are usually sharply focused on one subject, topic, or problem. They are sometimes given to new ideas and material which just wasn't there to be taught when their participants were undergraduates. Because they are autonomous and short-term, and because their participants already know a good deal about how to teach their subject, their directors and faculties can experiment without worrying about whether they are compromising the effectiveness of another part of the curriculum, or whether a failed experiment will graduate a class of teachers who will go into their classrooms without any good idea of what to do in them. For all these reasons, summer institutes, especially when they are innovative rather than simply remedial, can effect changes impossible to other kinds of teacher education. In them new possibilities of defining and teaching a subject can meet the competence and experience of those who teach it at every educa-

tional level, and all of it - the possibilities, the subject, the teachers, the schools - can be changed by the meeting.

But to say that summer institutes will always be useful is still to beg the question of why they have not changed other ways of educating teachers. Maybe it is the system, which seems to be not so much inflexible as to be marvelously capable of incorporating any new pattern without changing the shape or primacy of the old ones. That at least looks to be a lesson of a report by Professor Walter H. Crockett, Joseph C. Bently, and James D. Laird (1967) on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. In this program elementary and secondary school teachers were taught on college and university campuses during the year in regularly scheduled and in specially devised courses. Typically, the fellowship programs seemed to be going their ways without any effect on other graduate and undergraduate programs in which prospective teachers were being educated (pp. 6-7). Professor Axelrod's report on a summer institute for undergraduates who intend to teach foreign language in the schools as much as surrenders to the capacity of the system to swallow something new without digesting it. His conclusions suggest an attempt to carve out within the regular curriculum kind of conservatory for prospective foreign language teachers, complete with language houses, separate courses for students intending to teach, and schedules commanded by the demonstrated truth that people learn a lot of language when they take a lot of language courses at the same time.

But the addition of yet another special program within the already monstrously various undergraduate curriculum seems a small return for all the energy and invention which have gone into and happened in all those

summer institutes. The place for large and significant change is in the courses taught by the thousands of college teachers who have given at least a summer to the deliberate and explicit purposes of educating teachers. The system, no question, is formidable. But these members of college and university faculties have power on the system. They certainly can reshape their own courses, and redirect the whole emphasis and ends of their own teaching, much more quickly and easily than can the elementary and secondary school teachers who are always being exhorted to change by the directors and faculties of summer institutes.

Where to begin? Some of the answers to that question will be offered by the results of the Training of Teachers of Teachers program, which will encourage people in colleges and universities to devise and try out new ways to educate prospective teachers. Some other answers may be available if a study were undertaken of the kinds of changes set abroad by those members of college and university faculties who attended the summer institutes for trainers of teachers in the summer of 1966. And some answers, or at least some more precise questions, are apparent in the lessons taught by the common experience of summer institutes in the humanities and social sciences.

There is, for example, the matter of practicality, which can be followed back to the undergraduate methods course, that interesting but sadly sagging bridge between a discipline and its pedagogy. If scholars in the humanities and social sciences really want to do something about how their subjects are taught in the schools, the methods course looks to be an obvious place for them to start. They ought not to end there. They ought to discover, as some of the historians, economists, geographers,

and others who have taught in summer institutes have discovered, the necessity of defining what an elementary or secondary school course in their disciplines ought to be. Then they can take that definition back to their own courses and work out what they think a prospective teacher, and anyone else who does not intend to make a profession of the study of a discipline, ought to know about it in order to comprehend its nature and procedures, what it is, and how, and maybe why, it is done.

There is the fact that one of the great sources of excitement in institutes is a renewed sense of profession, which opens the question of how practice teaching can be used to educate prospective teachers in the range and realities of their futures. Can prospective teachers teach earlier - in their second year of college, say - so that later courses in their subject and its pedagogy are framed by some sense of the ground on which these ideas and practices must be exercised? Can prospective teachers teach more variously than they now do when they are in college - in different kinds of schools, in tutorial programs on campus itself, to one another? Can the academic departments in which prospective teachers learn their subjects also implicate themselves in their students' first attempts to teach, so that prospective teachers, like participants in institutes, get a sense of themselves as teachers of a subject, as members of a discipline?

Finally, there is the fact that many institutes seem to succeed in giving teachers a feel of the nature of a subject. Think of the usual introductory courses in the disciplines of humanities and social sciences - those traditional thin surveys sketched out in lectures and big textbooks. Consider how a focus in these introductory courses on a single theme or

topic might, as it often has in institutes, offer prospective teachers (and anyone else, for that matter) a chance to learn what it is to do a subject, a chance to practice it as well as be told of the results of other people's practice.

One end of such speculations about courses in the matter and pedagogyical methods of a subject, and about the administration of practice teaching, might be a model program of teacher education, born of the lessons of summer institutes and perhaps refined and promulgated by means of summer institutes attended by teachers and supervisors of teachers. But changes in how prospective teachers are educated need not await the evolution of a model. All that needs to happen is that some of the members of the faculties of institutes accept the injunction they so confidently lay on their students, and learn in the institute the necessity and means to teach differently after it.

Ten years ago a report such as this one would have fastened on the inglorious state of learning and teaching in the schools, and pledged that college and university teachers were coming to help. In summer institutes, we have helped. Along the way we have discovered how to make the help we give in institutes more effective. These lessons are clear enough, and are probably already being applied. Summer institutes are probably more successful when they are narrow in their topics and themes rather than broad, exemplary and innovative in their purposes rather than remedial, and enroll teachers of about the same education, competence, and confidence. The faculties of institutes certafnly must learn to lecture less often and to adopt or devise ways for the participants really to participate in their own educations. The directors of institutes must

learn to make schedules which will allow participants time and space to make their own discoveries, and which will not dissipate the integrity of the institute in an anxious clutter of guest lecturers, uncertainly relevant films, and other peripheral events. Some effects which two years ago were only glimmering might be accomplished if more institutes were designed for elementary school teachers, school administrators, and college and university teachers of teachers. Some more precise effects will almost certainly be achieved if more institutes are designed to define, test, and propagate new kinds of courses and materials, new tactics and purposes for elementary and secondary school teachers. Most important, the directors and faculties of institutes must look very hard at how, or whether, institutes educate teachers in the methods and materials of teaching. For contained in that lesson are the entire identity and purpose of summer institutes as places in which people may learn something about a subject they must teach.

But this report, at this moment, ought not to end with lessons about how college and university teachers can use institutes to change teachers in the schools. It is time that we too learned from institutes how to change ourselves. We need perhaps to prepare for summer institutes, to come to them with courses and materials we want to persuade and educate teachers to teach. We need certainly to join with the graduates of institutes to prosecute their effects, to help teachers who have attended institutes teach teachers who have not. We need to learn more about the schools, about what is possible in them, where what is possible is inhibited, and how to dissolve those impediments. We ought to have learned, above all, the necessity for changing the ways we educate prospective teachers in our

own classrooms. It is not that, after all these years, we have finally learned where the difficulty lies, and behold, it is in ourselves. The difficulty lies everywhere - in the administrators, teachers, and students of the schools; in the faculties, administrations, and students of the colleges and universities. It is simply that institutes ought finally to teach us that because part of the problem lies on our campuses and in our classrooms, we can go a long way towards its resolution without working to change anybody but ourselves.

REFERENCES

Axelrod, J. From Undergraduate Student to Professional Teacher. New York: Modern Language Association, 1967.

NDEA Foreign Language Institute Programs: The Development of a New Educational Model. New York: Modern Language Association, 1967.

Brown, D., and Brown, J. Effects of Special Media Institute Programs Upon the Behavior of Title XI NDEA Institute Directors (English, History, Geography, Reading, Modern Foreign Languages, and School Library Personnel). Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

Brown, J. Evaluations of Summer 1966 NDEA Institutes for Educational Media Specialists and School Library Personnel. San Jose, California: Educational Media Institute, 1966.

Cate, J. L. The 1965 History Institutes Revisited. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1966.

Cohen, S. B. (Ed.) Final Report of the NDEA Geography Institutes Evaluation Program. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Geographers and National Council for Geographic Education, 1965.

Crockett, W. H., Bentley, J. C., and Laird, J. D. The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-67. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1967.

Gray, D. J. Report on the Arts and Humanities Institutes of 1966. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

(Ed.) The 1965 Institutes in English. New York: Modern Language Association and National Council of Teachers English, 1966.

Hackett, D. F., Schad, J. A., and Stake, R. E. Report on the Summer 1966 Industrial Arts Institutes. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

Hook, J. N. NDEA Institutes for Trainers of Teachers (Summer, 1966). Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, Bureau of Research, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.

Longaker, R., and Cleary, R. Report on Evaluation of Pilot Civics Institutes, NDEA 1966. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

Reese, J. E., and Darcy, R. L. Report on the 1966 NDEA Advanced Study Institute in Economics. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

Shugrue, M., Barth, C., and Ruth, L. The Use of English Institutes Materials Center Curriculum Materials in NDEA Summer Institutes in English. Washington, D. C.: Consortium of Professional Associations, 1966.

Thompson, J. M. (Ed.) Teachers, History and NDEA Institutes 1965. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Learned Societies, 1966.